



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,643	01/20/2004	Scott Petersen	1001.1735101	5318
28075 7590 06/19/2009 CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				
EXAMINER				
SEVERSON, RYAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3731				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,643

Applicant(s)

PETERSEN, SCOTT

Examiner

Ryan J. Severson

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,16-26 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,7,18,22,23 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,9,16,17,19-21,24,25 and 33-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 16, 17, 20, 21, 25 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft et al. (6,007,558) in view of Suon et al. (6,342,062).** Ravenscroft reference discloses the filter (10) substantially as claimed, including: an apical head (12) and filter legs, with each filter leg including a joined end section (at 12) and a free end section (opposite 12). Each filter leg also includes a support member (32) coupled to an anchoring member (28) to secure the filter to the inner wall of the vessel. The filter also contains a plurality of filter tubes (26) with an inner lumen that receives the support members (see Figures 4-6). The filter tubes are joined at one end by a hub (see Figure 8, Ref. Numeral 38). However, Ravenscroft reference does not disclose a retrieval means for retrieving the filter. Attention is drawn to Suon reference, which teaches the expandable filter may be retrieved using a retrieval device (see figure 6) to allow the filter to be removed and/or repositioned if desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a retrieval device, as taught by Suon reference, with the filter of Ravenscroft reference, to allow the filter to be removed and/or repositioned if desired. The retrieval device of Suon reference has a tubular inner

member (51), a tubular middle member (60) that is capable of engaging the hub, and an outer sheath (40) for encapsulating the filter.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft et al. (6,007,558) in view of Suon et al. (6,342,062) and Whitcher et al. (6,273,901).** The combination of Ravenscroft and Suon references does not disclose the filter further comprising a landing pad secured to the free end of each filter tube. Attention is drawn to Whitcher reference, which teaches a landing pad (see Figure 8, Ref. Numeral 42A) may be used at the free end of a filter to spread the force applied at the tips of the filter over a greater area, thereby reducing the pressure on the contact or grasping points. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach the landing pads of Whitcher reference to the filter tubes of the combination of Ravenscroft and Suon references to allow the hook (28) of the support member to pass through to spread the force applied at the tips of the filter over a greater area, thereby reducing the pressure on the contact or grasping points. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the need to secure the pads to the tubes and not the legs to still allow the Ravenscroft reference to function as intended (i.e. allowing the legs to be retracted and moveable to and through the filter tubes). If this were not the case, when the legs of Ravenscroft are retracted into the tubes, the pads would simply be loose in the vessel, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the need to avoid this situation.

4. **Claims 24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft et al. (6,007,558) in view of Suon et al. (6,342,062) as applied to claims 16 and 35 above, and further in view of Hebert et al. (6,482,221).** The combination of Ravenscroft and Suon references does not disclose the inner member of the retrieval device of Suon reference comprises a braided tubular member. Attention is drawn to Hebert reference, which teaches a tubular member is made of a braided material (see Column 8, Lines 55-56) to provide varying flexibility to the device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the inner member of the retrieval device of Suon reference with a braided material, as taught by Hebert reference, to provide varying flexibility to the device.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 18 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Suon presents the same problems as previously cited art to Ostrovsky. However, Examiner disagrees, as Ostrovsky was withdrawn because it lacked a "tubular" inner member. It is the Examiner's position that the tubular element (60) of Suon is capable of engaging the hub (38) of Ravenscroft in the proposed combination. For example, the inner surface of the tubular member (60) could engage an outer edge of hub 38. Structure 40 of Ravenscroft would not prevent this from happening because they are the same diameter as the hub, and thereby the inner surface of the tubular member could lie flush against the outer surface of the hub 38 and structure 40.

6. Further, it is the Examiners position that the tubular member (50) is capable of compressing axially (therefore radially expanding) at least a minimal distance when longitudinal force is applied to it.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan J. Severson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3142. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30-5:00.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anh Tuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. J. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3731
6/18/09

/Anh Tuan T. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731
6/18/09